

REMARKS

A petition and fee for a two-month extension to respond to the above-identified Office Action are being submitted concurrently herewith.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being submitted concurrently herewith.


Claims 8 and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the claims can be found in the original drawings and the description on pages 5-7 of the Specification.

The rejection of claims 8 and 9 as being anticipated by Schug '587 is respectfully traversed. Schug teaches a discharge tube that initially has two opposed side arms 14 with an open terminal end 18 through which the electrode assembly 20 is inserted. Col. 5, ll. 47-61. However, once the electrode assembly **is sealed to the arc discharge tube envelope**, these side arms are no longer open. Because of this the discharge tube is subsequently filled through the side tubulation arm 13. Col. 7, lines 14-39. As such, the discharge tube of Schug, when the electrode assembly is sealed thereto, no longer contains open channels at each end **in the seal region** that provide a passageway from outside the arc tube into the discharge region for gas or solid fill materials to be placed in the discharge region. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Schug.

The rejection of claims 8 and 9 as being anticipated by Wyner et al. '117 is respectfully traversed. The passages 40, 42 of Wyner et al. do not constitute open channels as asserted by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully asserts that these passages only provide access to the interior of the feedthrough tube 16, the outer end 46 of which is hermetically sealed. Col. 5, ll. 4-26 and Fig. 5. The internal volume of the feedthrough is intended as a reservoir for the fill material. Thus, the passages 40, 42 are only in communication with the interior volume of the discharge tube and cannot constitute the open channels in a press seal region that provide a passageway from outside the arc tube into the discharge region as claimed by the Applicant. Since Wyner et al. does not teach this element of the claims, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Wyner et al.

In view of the foregoing amendment, it is believed that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert F. Clark". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "R".

Robert F. Clark
Reg. No. 33,853

OSRAM SYLVANIA Inc.
100 Endicott St.
Danvers, MA 01923